

REMARKS

Claims 1-34 remain in the present application. Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration of the rejections based on the arguments set forth below.

Drawing Objections

Paragraph 2 objects to Figure 2 of the present application as being unclear (e.g., "not readable"). Applicants have submitted here with formal drawings which will obviate the objections to the drawings of the present application.

35 U.S.C. Section 102 rejections

Paragraph 4 of the above referenced Office Action states that independent Claims 1 and 10 are rejected as allegedly being anticipated by Sanchez-Frank et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,394,522), hereafter Sanchez. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Embodiments of the present invention relate to a method and system for configuring input/output connections in a programmable logical device. For example, independent Claim 1 recites a method for configuring input/output connections in a programmable logical device comprising, displaying a graphical user interface for configuring the programmable logical device, selecting a configuration presentation from the graphical user interface, selecting an input/output connection from the programmable logical device for

configuration, and selecting options for configuring the input/output connections from a selection set presented in said graphical user interface.

Applicants respectfully point out the fact that the input/output connections recited in Claim 1 refer to the input/output pins of the programmable logical device. The configuration that takes place is configuration for the pins of the programmable logical device. Independent Claims 1, 10, and 18 have each been amended to explicitly point out that the input/output connections which are being configured comprise pins of the programmable logical device. This is completely different from the "connections" of the Sanchez reference.

Paragraph 4 of the above referenced Office Action alleges that Sanchez shows input/output connection(s) as recited in the claimed invention. Applicants understand Sanchez to teach "connections" between servers and workstations in a data processing network. For example, Sanchez recites a method of operation by which a network administrator can graphically depict a network of workstation nodes and generate configuration parameters for the various workstations (e.g., Sanchez column 2, lines 14-22). The connections of Sanchez refer to the network connections across a network (e.g., Token Ring local area network) between the workstation nodes. This is completely different from the input/output pins of a programmable logical device of the claimed invention.

Additionally, Applicants point out that the programmable logical device recited in, for example, Claim 1, is completely different from the "server" of Sanchez. Applicants point out that the programmable logical device refers to an integrated circuit component (e.g., a chip) having a plurality of input/output pins.

Independent Claims 1 and 10 have been amended to specifically point out the fact that the input/output connection comprises a pin for the programmable logical device. Accordingly, for the rationale described above, the present invention as recited in independent Claims 1 and 10 is not anticipated by the Sanchez reference within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. Section 102.

35 U.S.C. Section 103 rejections

Paragraph 10 of the above referenced Office Action states that independent Claim 18 is rejected as allegedly being rendered unpatentable by Sanchez, in combination with Bergeron (US Patent No. 6,246,410), Livingston (US Patent No. 6,750,889), and Ohara (US Patent No. 6,366,300). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Paragraph 10 of the above referenced Office Action relies on Sanchez to show input/output connection(s) as recited in the claimed invention. For the rationale described above, Applicants point out that Sanchez teaches "connections" between servers and workstations in a data processing network. The connections of Sanchez refer to the network connections across a network

(e.g., Token Ring local area network) between the workstation nodes, and thus is completely different from the input/output pins of a programmable logical device of the claimed invention.

Independent Claim 18 has been amended to specifically point out the fact that the input/output connection comprises a pin for the programmable logical device. Accordingly, for the rationale described above, the present invention as recited in independent Claim 18 is not rendered unpatentable by the cited combination within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. Section 103.

Paragraph 11 of the above referenced Office Action states that independent Claim 29 is rejected as allegedly being rendered unpatentable by Sanchez, in combination with Livingston and Ohara. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Paragraph 11 of the above referenced Office Action relies on Sanchez to show input/output connection(s) as recited in the claimed invention. For the rationale described above, Applicants point out that Sanchez teaches "connections" between servers and workstations in a data processing network. The connections of Sanchez refer to the network connections across a network (e.g., Token Ring local area network) between the workstation nodes, and thus is completely different from the input/output pins of a programmable logical device of the claimed invention.

Applicants assert that the connections of Sanchez occur between servers and workstations (e.g., "nodes") in a data processing network and any configuring that takes place is of such connections between nodes. Sanchez teaches a graphical configuration process for setting up connections between the nodes of the network. For example, Sanchez recites a method of operation by which a network administrator can graphically depict a network of workstation nodes and generate configuration parameters for the various workstations (e.g., Sanchez column 2, lines 14-22). The connections of Sanchez refer to the protocol configuration and network connections across a network (e.g., Token Ring local area network) between the workstation nodes. This is completely different from the input/output pins of a programmable logical device of the claimed invention.

Accordingly, Applicants point out that there is no suggestion by any teaching of Sanchez at the time the invention was made for any combination with Ohara or Livingston. Accordingly, for the rationale described above, the present invention as recited in independent Claim 29 is not rendered unpatentable by the cited combination within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. Section 103.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully assert that all claims (Claims 1-34) are now in condition for allowance and Applicants earnestly solicit such action from the Examiner.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 23-0085.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP

Dated: 10/28, 2004



Glenn Barnes
Registration No. 42,293

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060